

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this case, as amended, is requested. Claims 1-5, and 7-11 remain in this case, claims 1, 7, and 8 being amended in this communication. A Notice of Allowance in this case was issued on January 7, 2005, with the Issue Fee due on April 7, 2005. The Issue Fee has not yet been paid.

The Applicant recently discovered typographical errors in claims 1, 7, and 8. More specifically, the phrase “subtracting the set point value from a phase value” in claims 1, 7, and 8 should actually read “subtracting a phase value from the set point value”. This amendment is fully supported by the application as filed. The language of claims 1 and 7 is supported on page 12, lines 8-17. Part of that passage specifically states “[a]t this juncture, if phase 61 value is greater than set point 12 value, the new E0 or the treated E0 is set to be the value resulting from a difference of set point 12 value minus the phase 61 value.” (present application, page 12, lines 12-14, emphasis added). The language of claim 8 is supported on page 12, line 18-25 and claim 2, as filed. “At this juncture, if phase 61 value is less than set point 12 value, the new E0 or the treated E0 is set to be the value resulting from a difference of set point 12 value minus the phase 61 value.” (present application, page 12, lines 20-22, emphasis added). No new matter has been added.

The scope of the claims is not affected by the amendments. The scope of the method and system of claims 1 and 7, respectively, have not been affected. The order of subtraction is just different than in the allowed claims. In addition, the Examiner allowed the claims based on the incorporation of claims 6 and 12 into claims 1 and 7, respectively. The limitations originally in claims 6 and 12 have not been amended.

The specification has also been amended to correct typographical errors. In addition, the Summary of the Invention has been amended to correspond to the amendments to the claims. These amendments are fully supported by the specification on page 12, lines 8-25, as filed. No new matter has been added.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the claims, as amended, are now correct and patentable over the prior art, and that this case is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

"Recognizing that Internet communications are not secured, I hereby authorize the PTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file."

Respectfully Submitted:

Zhenyu Jiang

By: 

Meghan Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 45,612
Attorney for Applicant

BROWN & MICHAELS, P.C.
400 M&T Bank Building - 118 N. Tioga St.
Ithaca, NY 14850

(607) 256-2000 • (607) 256-3628 (fax)

e-mail: docket@bpmlegal.com

Dated: 4/7/05